

**OPINION 2080 (Case 3233)*****Achatina janii* De Betta & Martinati, 1855 (currently *Cecilioides janii*; Mollusca, Gastropoda): proposed conservation of the specific name not approved**

**Abstract.** The Commission has ruled that priority should be maintained for the specific name of a subterranean, eyeless pulmonate, *Achatina veneta* Strobel, 1855. The junior synonym *Achatina janii* De Betta & Martinati, 1855 is not conserved.

**Keywords.** Nomenclature; taxonomy; Mollusca; Gastropoda; FERUSSACIIDAE; *Cecilioides janii*; *Cecilioides veneta*; pulmonates; southern Europe.

---

**Ruling**

- (1) Under the plenary power it is hereby ruled that priority is to be maintained for the name *veneta* Strobel, 1855, as published in the binomen *Achatina veneta*.
- (2) The name *veneta* Strobel, 1855, as published in the binomen *Achatina veneta* is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

**History of Case 3233**

An application to conserve the specific name of *Achatina janii* De Betta & Martinati, 1855 for a subterranean, eyeless pulmonate gastropod from southern Europe, threatened by *Achatina veneta* Strobel, 1855, was received from F. Giusti and G. Manganelli (Università di Siena, Siena, Italy) on 26 February 2002. After correspondence the case was published in BZN 59: 77–81 (June 2002). The title, abstract and keywords of the case were published on the Commission's website. A comment opposing the application was published in BZN 60: 51–52. A reply to the opposing comment in which the authors further support their application was published in BZN 60: 52.

The application was sent to the Commission for voting on 1 September 2003. The case received a majority of the votes cast on 1 December 2003 but failed to reach the required two-thirds majority (13 votes FOR, 8 AGAINST; 1 Commissioner abstained). Voting against, Ng commented that while in sympathy with the applicants' case and arguments he was compelled, in lieu of greater support from the malacological community, to vote in favour of keeping the status quo. Banks et al. (2000) fixed the taxonomy following the Code and theirs is the most recent treatment. He further stated that the species involved here is also not of substantial biological significance and the name has been used primarily by taxonomists. The application was submitted for a second vote under Bylaw 35.

**Decision of the Commission**

On 1 March 2004 the members of the Commission were invited to vote again on the proposals published in BZN 59: 79. At the close of the voting period on 1 June 2004 the votes were as follows: 13 Commissioners voted FOR the proposals, 8 Commissioners voted AGAINST, Bouchet, Calder and Ng were on leave of absence, no vote was received from Macpherson.

The case received a majority of the votes cast on the second vote but since the two-thirds majority required under Bylaw 35 was not achieved the proposals were not approved.

### Original reference

The following is the original reference to the name placed on an Official List by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

*veneta*, *Achatina*, Strobel, 1855, *Giornale di Malacologia*, **2**: 137.